

sample to go back and adjust Sarasota, Florida, to adjust Bradenton, Florida, my home area, or to adjust Miami. As if Atlanta has a lot in common statistically with Miami.

That is what they are going to be doing. That is one reason it is going to get thrown out in the courts, but it is just not going to be trusted.

I have proposed, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census in Congress, ideas to improve the census. We are fully supportive of all the resources that the Census Bureau needs to do the best job possible next year. In fact, this Republican Congress is giving the Census Bureau \$200 million more than requested by the administration during the past 2 years to get prepared for this census.

For example, one area that we have already passed out of subcommittee and that is something called post-census local review. I think that is very important to build trust in our census. It was used in 1990. What it basically consists of is, after the Census Bureau conducts the census, they will send the numbers to the local cities and counties to give them a brief time to review the numbers and check for errors. It is kind of an audit. And then if they have questions or problems with it, they can let the Census Bureau know and the Census Bureau will go back and check those numbers.

Now, in 1990, Detroit added 45,000 people. Cleveland added people. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) talked about a whole ward that was mistakenly left out of one of his areas in his congressional district in Wisconsin. Mistakes are made. The Bureau is not perfect. But they are refusing to allow cities and counties the opportunity to check the numbers before they become official.

Every elected official in the country should be supportive of this. It is only the Census Bureau that says, "Oh, it's a pain. It's too much trouble. We don't want to deal with trouble."

We have got to build trust in this census. What you are doing by not allowing post-census local review as was allowed in 1990 is you are building up distrust already because you are trying to hide something. That is wrong. We need to build up that confidence that we are doing the right thing. Why not let the local cities and counties have the opportunity to review the numbers? But, no, they are so fixated on this second number census that they will not do anything to improve and build on the full enumeration.

Mr. Speaker, we need to go to a full enumeration for all Americans to be counted in the year 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DUNCAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO PROTECT SATELLITE HOME VIEWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield half of that time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, but let me first inform the House and the American public that, as many now know, consumers across America have been notified that they will soon lose access to network programming signals that are currently delivered via satellite.

Satellite television distributors are under now a Federal court order to terminate delivery of these network signals because of a finding that distributors have violated the Satellite Home Viewers Act. What we learned in the subcommittee yesterday was that, with new FCC findings, some 220,000 American citizens who are scheduled to be terminated from network signal delivery are, in fact, qualified to receive those signals legally under the act.

What we are announcing today is the filing of a moratorium bill, with the support of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a lot of other members of our committee and Members of this Congress, a moratorium bill to give us 90 days to work this problem out without unnecessarily cutting off Americans from network programming delivered by satellite. It is intolerable that over 200,000 citizens would be terminated in that service without giving them a chance to qualify under the act according to the FCC's new findings.

Let me point out we are not suggesting in our legislation that any violations of law be tolerated. Those folks who can receive local signals are going to have to do so. But the hundreds of thousands who are going to get cut off this weekend unnecessarily should not be cut off, and we are hopeful that this moratorium bill can become law quickly next week in order to protect their rights.

We had hoped that the parties could settle this. We still encourage them to do so this weekend. We had hoped that the broadcast and satellite industries would walk into court this weekend together and ask the court to modify its injunction to incorporate the new FCC findings so that these hundreds of thousands of Americans would not lose their network signals.

But unless the parties go to court this weekend and modify the injunc-

tion, our only way to protect those consumers while we work with the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Commerce on a new Satellite Home Viewers Act to provide those local signals to consumers, our only hope will be this moratorium bill which we are filing today and which we intend to move expeditiously next week absent an agreement by the parties to do so.

I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman points out, there are thousands of people across the country who are affected by this court ordered cut-off of distant TV signals, meaning that people with satellite dishes cannot pick up the national NBC or CBS or ABC or Fox feed. Specifically here I think CBS and Fox are in question.

The legislation that we are introducing today will help give consumers limited relief to reapply for permission to obtain these signals or to apply for waivers from their local broadcasters, that is, write or visit their local TV station and say, "Please, I can't get your signal here locally. Let me take this national feed so I can gain advantage to the programming, news and entertainment that are so valuable for my family."

Equally important, it will give Congress additional time to develop a long-term plan to update the Satellite Home Viewer Act and to include permission for satellite local-to-local broadcasts. Meaning that we have to now develop as a strategy a way in which an individual with an 18-inch dish now, to pick up their local TV stations.

Today, they cannot do that. Today, it is impossible. If you want to have a satellite dish, you have to give up access to your local TV stations. You have got to put up your own antenna. You have got to subscribe to the cable service as a supplement.

□ 1230

But you cannot get it all from a satellite dish.

What we are going to try to do this year is craft legislation that will make it possible for you to buy an 18-inch satellite dish, pick up all of that great cable and satellite programming and have access to your local TV stations at the same time. Then people will have real consumer choice.

So, the legislation, which has been drafted by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) working with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and I and other members of our committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) and a long list of Members is something which we think makes lot of sense. But again, we have this moment arriving where on March 31 all regulation of the cable industry goes off the books, and we, as the committee, are going to have to respond. We are going to have to find ways of insuring that the consumers